
Subject: CarrierII's avatar

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Sun, 07 Jun 2009 16:02:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm just wondering what is in your avatar?I can't quite make it out.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Sun, 07 Jun 2009 16:19:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Tassadar from StarCraft, you fool!

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar

Posted by [LiL KiLLa](#) on Sun, 07 Jun 2009 16:21:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar

Posted by [ErroR](#) on Sun, 07 Jun 2009 19:06:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

was wondering too, but figured it's from starcraft , looks like a panda o.O

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Sun, 07 Jun 2009 20:18:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

LiL KiLLa wrote on Sun, 07 June 2009 17:21

Mind if I use that as my avatar?

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar

Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sun, 07 Jun 2009 20:40:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ErroR wrote on Sun, 07 June 2009 14:06was wondering too, but figured it's from starcraft , looks like a panda o.O
what the hell kind of pandas have you seen, that sounds like a nightmare

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sun, 07 Jun 2009 21:04:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

liquidv2 wrote on Sun, 07 June 2009 15:40ErroR wrote on Sun, 07 June 2009 14:06was wondering too, but figured it's from starcraft , looks like a panda o.O
what the hell kind of pandas have you seen, that sounds like a nightmare

Nightmare panda's look like this:

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Sun, 07 Jun 2009 21:56:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Sun, 07 June 2009 15:18LiL KiLLa wrote on Sun, 07 June 2009 17:21

Mind if I use that as my avatar?

You should! Tassadar in the pic is actually looking at a monitor logged onto Renforums and deleting trolls.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [slosha](#) on Sun, 07 Jun 2009 22:03:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nikki6ixx wrote on Sun, 07 June 2009 16:04liquidv2 wrote on Sun, 07 June 2009 15:40ErroR wrote on Sun, 07 June 2009 14:06was wondering too, but figured it's from starcraft , looks like a panda o.O
what the hell kind of pandas have you seen, that sounds like a nightmare

Nightmare panda's look like this:

I lol'd

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Mon, 08 Jun 2009 00:31:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Sun, 07 June 2009 11:19Tassadar from StarCraft, you fool!

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 08 Jun 2009 01:36:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Everyone knows Battlecruisers > Carriers.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Mon, 08 Jun 2009 08:48:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Carrier rush.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 08 Jun 2009 09:43:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Mon, 08 June 2009 01:48Carrier rush.

Assuming equal (Or at least similar) numbers, BattleCruisers put carriers to shame. Interceptors deal poor damage to high-armor targets like BattleCruisers, and as if that wasn't enough, Yamato Cannon decides the battle before it begins. Take the example of 12 carriers vs 12 BCs; Two BattleCruisers Yamatoing a carrier is enough to destroy it, which means 12 v 12 instantly becomes 12 v 6.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Mon, 08 Jun 2009 10:50:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You've got 12 BC when I've got 6 carriers at ~15ish minutes into the game? (Well, I can't play that fast, but my elder brother could demonstrate the principle)

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Mon, 08 Jun 2009 11:37:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ZERGLING RUSH KEKEKEKE

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 08 Jun 2009 11:57:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Mon, 08 June 2009 03:50 You've got 12 BC when I've got 6 carriers at ~15ish minutes into the game? (Well, I can't play that fast, but my elder brother could demonstrate the principle)

In order to get 6 carriers out in 15 minutes, you will have to have teched straight to it and build absolutely no other forces. If that's your strategy, you won't get very far past your Stargate.

Note that faggoty \$\$\$FASTEST\$MONEY\$MAPS\$\$\$ don't count. That's not StarCraft, that's AIDS impersonating StarCraft.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Mon, 08 Jun 2009 12:11:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

True, we can get it to function against the AI quite well, but human vs human games are a whole different ballgame.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 08 Jun 2009 12:53:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Mon, 08 June 2009 05:11 True, we can get it to function against the AI quite well, but human vs human games are a whole different ballgame.

The AI is silly. You can take on seven terran comps alone with Protoss because they let you pump out Dark Templar before they can build any detectors. It's a strange combination of sad and funny to watch 7 bases be destroyed by one unit each.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 00:38:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just to prove my point, here's what happens when a Protoss player tries to tech straight for carriers against a competent Terran player.

<http://www.gomtv.net/classics3/vod/750>

Note that this strategy is actually (Somewhat) viable here, because of the size of the map and because of the strategy employed by the players (Flash is known to turtle quite a bit. Fast carriers when executed correctly are something of an "anti-turtle" build). Even with how delayed the comsat was already, the carriers still get discovered before they're ready to act, giving Flash (The Terran player) ample time to counter.

If you're wondering why Reach (The Protoss player) went for this somewhat odd build, here's the replay/commentary from the game immediately preceding, where Flash turtles very well stopping any shuttle/reaver action cold, and very effectively blocking any intel gathering with observers:

<http://www.gomtv.net/classics3/vod/749>

Needless to say, there was no game 3.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 00:44:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Did you ever switch to that other avatar. Cuz if you did, it doesn't look like it on my computer.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Omar007](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 11:16:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Muad Dib15 wrote on Mon, 29 June 2009 02:44Did you ever switch to that other avatar. Cuz if you did, it doesn't look like it on my computer.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [ErroR](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 12:58:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

my guess is he didn't

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Omar007](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 13:21:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ErroR wrote on Mon, 29 June 2009 14:58my guess is he didn't
I know
Just wondering why he didnt yet

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 17:37:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Toggle Spoiler

Dover wrote on Mon, 29 June 2009 01:38Just to prove my point, here's what happens when a Protoss player tries to tech straight for carriers against a competent Terran player.

<http://www.gomtv.net/classics3/vod/750>

Note that this strategy is actually (Somewhat) viable here, because of the size of the map and because of the strategy employed by the players (Flash is known to turtle quite a bit. Fast carriers when executed correctly are something of an "anti-turtle" build). Even with how delayed the comsat was already, the carriers still get discovered before they're ready to act, giving Flash (The Terran player) ample time to counter.

If you're wondering why Reach (The Protoss player) went for this somewhat odd build, here's the replay/commentary from the game immediately preceeding, where Flash turtles very well stopping any shuttle/reaver action cold, and very effectively blocking any intel gathering with observers:

<http://www.gomtv.net/classics3/vod/749>

Needless to say, there was no game 3.

I dislike professional Starcraft because unless both players can unit spam (IE click) equally fast, strategy is all but irrelevant.

As for the avatar, I never received any word of Lil KiLLa saying he didn't mind me using it.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [LiL KiLLa](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 17:42:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I still wait...till I see the moving tassadar head in your avatar

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 17:43:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Then this will take some time...

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [LiL KiLLa](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 17:44:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

if you want, you can use it now

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 17:48:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No I can't, the file is too big.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [ErroR](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 18:34:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

har har har

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Omar007](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 22:40:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ErroR wrote on Mon, 29 June 2009 20:34har har har

Sorry for dubble post (below)
Forum gave submit error but did submitted it anyway :S

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Omar007](#) on Mon, 29 Jun 2009 22:42:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DELETE

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 30 Jun 2009 01:42:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Mon, 29 June 2009 10:37Toggle Spoiler

Dover wrote on Mon, 29 June 2009 01:38Just to prove my point, here's what happens when a Protoss player tries to tech straight for carriers against a competent Terran player.

<http://www.gomtv.net/classics3/vod/750>

Note that this strategy is actually (Somewhat) viable here, because of the size of the map and because of the strategy employed by the players (Flash is known to turtle quite a bit. Fast carriers when executed correctly are something of an "anti-turtle" build). Even with how delayed the comsat was already, the carriers still get discovered before they're ready to act, giving Flash (The Terran player) ample time to counter.

If you're wondering why Reach (The Protoss player) went for this somewhat odd build, here's the replay/commentary from the game immediately preceding, where Flash turtles very well stopping any shuttle/reaver action cold, and very effectively blocking any intel gathering with observers:

<http://www.gomtv.net/classics3/vod/749>

Needless to say, there was no game 3.

I dislike professional Starcraft because unless both players can unit spam (IE click) equally fast, strategy is all but irrelevant.

Untrue. In fact, these two players have about equal Macro

Strategy is far from irrelevant, especially in the games I posted here. Watch the first video (Game 2). Reach (Protoss) knows Flash (Terran) will turtle and come out with a huge army once he maxes out his supply (A strategy). In response, Reach (Protoss) goes for fast carriers, to counter Flash's (Terran's) turtling (A counter-strategy, largely unused otherwise). Flash (Terran) is wise to his shit thanks to a Comsat scan, to after a brief period of pumping turrets to buy time, he produces a huge amount of Goliaths and a small amount of tanks, rather than small amount of Goliaths and large amount of tanks typical to Terran VS Protoss builds (Counter-counter-strategy). Good strategy/counter-strategy is what won him the game.

How well you can micro/macro, or what you call "click-spamming" is important, but only to the extent that you can control what's going on in the game. You can click as fast as you want but it won't save you if you make all the wrong decisions. That is what buries Reach (Protoss) in Game 1 (The second video). He spends too much time trying to Reaver-drop, arbiter-drop and gather intel against a basically impenetrable set of turrets. What he should have done instead is either find a weak point in Flash's (Terran's) defenses, try to out-macro Flash (Terran) by getting more expansions sooner, or out-micro him by winning a big fight and pressing his advantage. What lost

him the game was bad strategy that was poorly executed, not clicking any slower.

I really hope you (And others like you) would start to shed the image of professional StarCraft as a clickfest. Certainly that's a part of it, but to say that all you need to do to win in StarCraft is click faster is to say that all you need to do in professional basketball is rebound better, or dribble faster. It's a small part is a large, complex game.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 30 Jun 2009 21:01:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I demand a response, CarrierII. Have you watched the videos yet?

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 01 Jul 2009 12:09:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah yeah triple post blah blah. Here's more evidence to prove my point. The same Terran player (Flash) facing a much more competent Protoss opponent (Stork, who at the time of the match was ranked 6 spots higher than Flash) in the GOMTV Star Invitationals finals. Game 1 on a map that heavily favors carrier harassment against Terran. Flash, again, making excellent use of comsat to detect the early stargates quickly (Even though they are placed in unconventional spots), and good use of goliaths to bring them down, much to the chagrin of Stork fans in the audience who can be heard crying out loudly above the commentators every time a carrier gets downed.

Inb4 clickspam complaining. These are two top-rated StarCraft players who both consistently pull equally-high APM (Actions Per Minute) above 300. This is all strategy, no clickspam.

Seriously, watch the damn matches. You have to be very harderned not to crack a smile to see Flash crapping all over Stork's Carriers like this, especially on a map that so heavily favors Protoss using Carriers.

Edit: And here, Flash (Terran) pulls it off again on game 4 on the same Carrier-heavy map (Katrina), with the same end result. Lesson: Fast carriers fail against competent Terran players, and of course garbage against Zerg. Fast Tech is a gimmick for when facing bad players or the AI.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Thu, 02 Jul 2009 17:11:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

For fast tech:

CarrierII wrote on Mon, 08 June 2009 13:11 True, we can get it to function against the AI quite well, but human vs human games are a whole different ballgame.

As for the click fest, the strategies chosen only have meaning if both players have roughly equal APM, else the strategy chosen is irrelevant, the player with the lower APM would be overrun, even if his strategy was better.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 03 Jul 2009 07:29:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Thu, 02 July 2009 10:11As for the click fest, the strategies chosen only have meaning if both players have roughly equal APM, else the strategy chosen is irrelevant, the player with the lower APM would be overrun, even if his strategy was better.

Untrue. And even if it was, you say it as if it's a bad thing. Part of the appeal in watching Flash is the absolute precision with which he controls the battlefield. Not one unit out of place, not one factor or SCV sitting idle.

It's like driving really fast in a race. Sure, it helps, but you also need to be driving in the right direction (Or in the case of StarCraft, making the right decisions and "clicking" on the right things in the right places). You'll notice in all the videos I've posted, Flash doesn't win by attrition and out-macroing his opponent--These aren't hour-and-a-half games, where it truly comes down to who can produce more units faster and fund them all.

Subject: Re: CarrierII's avatar
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Mon, 06 Jul 2009 22:57:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII needs a tassadar gif img... that can be used
